

REMARKS

In the Final Office Action, claims 1 and 3-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferchichi et al. in view of Gupta et al., claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferchichi et al. and Gupta et al., and further in view of Wu, claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferchichi et al. in view of Wu, and claims 11-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferchichi et al. and Wu, and further in view of Gupta et al.

First of all, applicant would like to elaborate a few unique features of the instant invention to clarify some points with respect to the comments made in the Final Office Action. In the instant invention as described in the specification, **the authentication between the ICP and the user-login-identification means is two-ways**. In other words, the ICP has to be authenticated to be able to access to the user-login-identification means (page 3, lines 25-28; page 9, lines 17-27), and the user's login identification has to be authenticated to be able to log into the ICP's web pages (page 5, lines 3-10; page 10, lines 5-16). Therefore, there exist two separate sets of authentication information, i.e., **ICP access authentication information** and **user's login identification information**. The former is to authenticate if an ICP can access the user-login-identification means and the latter is to authenticate if a user can log into ICP's web pages. **It is important to note that both sets of information are stored in the user-login-identification means in the instant invention.**

With respect to the comments made by Examiner in paragraphs 5-7, applicant

respectfully contends that Ferchichi only discloses one-way authentication, i.e., authentication of user's login identification for logging into the ICP. **There is neither any authentication of sign-on module (ICP) in accessing the smart card,** nor **any stored ICP authentication information** in Ferchichi, and therefore, applicant respectfully contends that the prior art structure is **not capable of** performing claim 1, and **does not meet** the claim.

With respect to the comments made by the examiner in paragraphs 8-9, applicant respectfully argues that original claim 1 recites “ICP adds an interface module in a login web page and **accesses the user-login-identification means via the interface module**” and “**ICP access authentication information is stored in the user-login-identification means to verify whether the accessing ICP is authorized to access; if the accessing ICP passed the verification, its access is permitted, otherwise the access is not permitted, wherein the ICP is permitted to access the user-login-identification means only if the ICP is authenticated**” has clearly constituted the limitation (an equivalent to **the ICP requests to access the user-login-identification means**) that applicant regards as not being disclosed by Ferchichi. In response to the examiner's comment, applicant further amends claim 1 to recite that “ICP adds an interface module in a login web page and **the ICP is authenticated to access** the user-login-identification means via the interface module” to more specifically distinguish with the cited prior arts in which the ICP has never been authenticated for accessing the smart card.

With respect to the comments made by the examiner in paragraphs 11-12, the original claim 1 clearly recites that “**the user-login-identification means is provided**

with an ID number, and user's login identification information is stored in the user-login-identification means". As pointed out in the response filed on 8/25/2008, Ferchichi only teaches storing **ID and password of a user** in its smart card. As can be seen in claim 1, this ID number in the instant invention, which is distinctly different from the ID of a user, is provided to the user-login-identification. It is unclear to the applicant why the examiner cannot find the limitation. In response, applicant further amends claim 1 to recite "**an identification (ID) number is provided to** the user-login-identification means, and user's login identification information is stored in the user-login-identification means" so as to avoid any confusion.

From the foregoing discussion, applicant respectfully argues that the amended claim 1 should be allowable based on the following limitations:

- (1) the **ICP is authenticated** to access the user-login-identification means;
- (2) an **identification (ID) number is provided to the user-login-identification means;**
- (3) **ICP access authentication information is stored in the user-login-identification means** to verify whether the accessing ICP is authorized to access.

As none of the cited prior arts including Ferchichi, Gupta and Wu teaches or suggests any of the above three limitations, applicant respectfully submits that the amended claim 1 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). By virtue of dependency, claims 2-9 should also be allowable.

The above amendment also amends claim 10 to specifically recite that the user-login-identification means “**has at least an identification number**”, “**stores ICP access authentication information and user’s login identification information**”, and “**the ICP is authenticated to access the user-login-identification means**”. For the same reasoning described above, applicant respectfully submits that the amended claim 10 should also be allowable based on these novel and non-obvious limitations over the cited prior arts under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). By virtue of dependency, claims 11-18 should also be allowable.

From the foregoing discussion, it is clear that the instant invention differs from the cited prior arts. The physical difference results in different effects and is not obvious. Claims 1-18 should be allowable. Prompt and favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jason Z. Lin/

Jason Z. Lin
Agent for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 37,492
Customer No. 33,804